

Appl. No. 09/663,891
Amdt. dated May 22, 2007
Reply to office action of February 22, 2007

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on February 22, 2007. The Office Action rejected Applicant's Claims 8-9 as being anticipated by US Pat. No. 6,473,860 ("Chan"), Claims 1, 3-4 and 6 as being obvious in view of the combination of Chan and US Pat. No. 5,654,746 ("McMullan"), Claim 2 as being obvious in view of the combination of Chan, McMullan and US Pat. No. 5,845,067 ("Porter"), Claims 10-22 and 24-38 as being obvious in view of the combination of Chan and US Pat. No. 6,237,786 ("Ginter"), Claims 23 and 39 as obvious in view of Chan, Ginter and US Pat. No. 5,951,620 ("Ahrens").

With this response, Applicant has amended Claims 1, 8, 10 and 24. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the pending Claims of the present application in view of the following remarks. Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim 1

Applicant's amended independent Claim 1 recites storing the combined product on a portable computer-readable storage medium and providing the computer-readable storage medium having the combined first portion and second portion to the user, wherein the user accesses the combined product from the storage medium with the computer platform at a third location different from the first location and the second location. Claim 1 is not obvious in view of the combination of Chan and McMullan because the combination fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned claim elements.

Briefly, Chan discloses a system for distributing and processing digital information, such as a movie, that is separated into two portions. The first portion is a clear (unencrypted) portion, and the second (residual) portion is encrypted. The clear portion is distributed to customers while the residual portion is stored in a central station. (See, Chan: column 2, lines 44-55). When the customer wishes to view the movie, the central station encrypts the residual portion and sends the encrypted portion and decryption key to a secure processor of the end user's processing unit. (See, Chan: column 11, lines 1-20). The secure processor decrypts the residual information using the decryption key. At the same time, the clear portion is sent to the secure processor from the general processor of the end user's processing unit. The secure processor

Appl. No. 09/663,891
Amdt. dated May 22, 2007
Reply to office action of February 22, 2007

combines the data and reconstructs the original digitized movie data, and the result is sent to the video interface for viewing by the user. (*See*, Chan: column 11, lines 40-45).

Chan does not disclose storing the combined product on a portable computer-readable storage medium and providing the storage medium to the user for access to the combined product from the storage medium with the computer platform at a third location that is different from the first and the second locations. In contrast, the Chan system merely executes the combined digital content (displays the movie) with the secure processor without storing the combined content. The Chan system does not allow the combined content to be used away from the secure processor. In fact, Chan specifically teaches away from storing the combined digital content and allowing the user to access the digital content away from the secure processor. Chan specifically teaches including analog copy protection in the video interface to prevent the analog output video from being copied. (*See*, Chan: column 11, lines 46-56). Accordingly, Chan fails to disclose and specifically teaches away from the above-mentioned claim elements.

Furthermore, McMullan does not disclose or suggest the above-mentioned claim elements. In fact McMullan specifically teaches away from storing the combined product on a portable computer-readable storage medium and providing the storage medium to the user for access to the combined product from the storage medium with the computer platform at a third location that is different from the first and the second locations. McMullan states

The home communications terminal is particularly secure from service pirates. The game data and authorization and control data are transmitted in a secure manner. Authorization data can only be read from the game adapter by the game player and not written into game adapter memory. (*See*, McMullan: column 2, lines 55-59).

Thus McMullan does not disclose and teaches away from storing the game data and accessing the game data away from the location of the game adapter/player.

For at least the above reasons, Claim 1 is not obvious in view of the combination of Chan and McMullan. Thus, independent Claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 8

Applicant's independent Claim 8 recites "a storage device interface associated with said data distribution terminal, wherein said storage device interface stores said combined product on a portable computer-readable storage medium, wherein said user accesses said combined product from said storage medium with a computer platform at a location different from said location of

Appl. No. 09/663,891
Amtd. dated May 22, 2007
Reply to office action of February 22, 2007

said data distribution terminal." Claim 8 is not anticipated by Chan because Chan fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned claim elements.

Chan does not disclose storing the combined product on a portable computer-readable storage medium and the user accessing the combined product from the storage medium with a computer platform at a location that is different from the location of the data distribution terminal. In contrast, the Chan system merely executes the combined digital content (displays the movie) with the secure processor without storing the combined content. The Chan system does not allow the combined content to be used away from the secure processor. In fact, Chan specifically teaches away from storing the combined digital content and allowing the user to access the digital content away from the secure processor. Chan specifically teaches including analog copy protection in the video interface to prevent the analog output video from being copied. (See, Chan: column 11, lines 46-56). Accordingly, Chan fails to disclose and specifically teaches away from the above-mentioned claim elements.

For at least the above reasons, Claim 8 is not anticipated by Chan. Thus, independent Claim 8 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 10

Applicant's independent Claim 10 recites a second set of logic to record onto a storage medium the encrypted first portion and the unencrypted second portion and the user accesses the data product at a location different from the first location and the second location. The combination of Chan and Ginter fails to disclose or suggest all of these claim elements.

Chan does not disclose recording the encrypted first portion and the unencrypted second portion onto a storage medium and the user accesses the data product at a location different from the first and second locations. In contrast, the Chan system merely executes the combined digital content (displays the movie) with the secure processor without storing the combined content. The Chan system does not allow the combined content to be used away from the secure processor. In fact, Chan specifically teaches away from storing the combined digital content and allowing the user to access the digital content away from the secure processor. Chan specifically teaches including analog copy protection in the video interface to prevent the analog output video from being copied. (See, Chan: column 11, lines 46-56). Accordingly, Chan fails to disclose and specifically teaches away from the above-mentioned claim elements.

Appl. No. 09/663,891
Amdt. dated May 22, 2007
Reply to office action of February 22, 2007

Ginter also fails to disclose or suggest the above recited claim elements. Simply, Ginter discloses a repository for storing entire data products not the recited two portions at different locations. (*See*, Ginter: column 297: lines 55-56). Accordingly, Ginter does not disclose storing the encrypted first portion and the unencrypted second portion onto a storage medium and the user accesses the data product at a location different from the first and second locations.

For at least these reasons, Claim 10 is not obvious in view of the combination of Chan and Ginter. Thus, independent Claim 10 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 24

Claim 24 recites a second set of logic to record onto a storage medium the encrypted first portion and the unencrypted second portion and providing the storage medium to a third entity that is at a location different from the first location and the second location. For similar reasons as discussed in conjunction with Claim 10, the combination of Chan and Ginter fails to disclose or suggest these claim elements. Thus, independent Claim 24 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-4, 6, 9, 11-23 and 25-39

Applicant's dependent Claims 2-4, 6, 9, 11-23 and 25-39 are allowable at least for the reason that they depend upon allowable base claims. In addition, these claims include features that are not disclosed by the cited references.

Conclusion

With the present response, all the issues in the Office Action mailed February 22, 2007 have been addressed. Applicant submits that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance. If any issues remain, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Jon D. Shutter
Reg. No. 41,311
Chief Patent Counsel

NAVTEQ North America, LLC
222 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Suite 900
Chicago, IL 60654
(312) 894-7000 x7365